UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Omega Consulting, as Assignee of	§	CASE NO 3 3 7
Mike Albert Leasing, Inc.	§	
Plaintiff	§	
	§	VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR
-V-	§	DAMAGES, BREACH OF
	§	FIDUCIARY DUTY,
Lee Way Holding Company	§	BREACH OF CONTRACT, GROSS
Defendant	§	MISMANAGEMENT, WASTE
	§	
	/	

COMES NOW, Omega Consulting, Plaintiff and Assignee of Mike Albert Leasing, Inc., and files this lawsuit against defendant Lee Way Holding Company for damages for breach of breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, gross mismanagement, and waste as those terms are understood in law.

PARTIES

- 1. Omega Consulting, (hereinafter "Plaintiff") is the Assignee of Liquidation Services, Inc., and Plaintiff is a sole proprietorship organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas and has a principal place of business at 7706 Pinebrook Drive; San Antonio, Texas 78230.
- Defendant Lee Way Holding Company is a Delaware corporation whose last known address is in Ohio at 2605 Commercial Ln; Columbus, OH 43232.

SERVICE

3. Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code 1701.88, process may be effectuated upon Lee Way Holding Company by delivering a copy to William Buckham, one of the the company's last known directors and its last known registered agent, at 103 Oakland Hills Court; Johns Creek, GA 30097.

JURISDICTION

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter because of the nature of the lawsuit, and because the amount in controversy exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limits for the district courts of the State of Ohio. Additionally, Defendant is a Delaware corporation which maintained a business address in Columbus, Ohio.

BACKGROUND FACTS

- 5. On July 24, 1987, Defendant, Lee Way Holding Company's certificate of authority to conduct business in Ohio was cancelled by the Ohio Secretary of State. On November 11, 1990, Defendant, Lee Way Holding Company's corporate chartered was canceled by the Division of Corporations for the State of Delaware.
- 6. On March 7, 1985, said Defendant filed a Chapter 11 bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Ohio. That bankruptcy case closed on August 13, 1998. Since August 14, 1998, said defendant has not wound up its affairs under the state of Ohio's corporation statutes, nor under Delaware corporation statutes.
- 7. On or about May 19, 2008, Assignor, Mike Albert Leasing, Inc. discovered that defendant, Lee Way Holding Company continued to own valuable choses in action or rights to recover unclaimed corporate assets which could have been utilized to satisfy an outstanding obligation to said Assignor totaling Two Hundred Twenty-Five Six Hundred Ninety-One Thousand Dollars & Sixty-Six (\$225,691.66), which represents original unpaid principle totaling Seventy Three Thousand Five Hundred Eighty-Seven Dollars & Sixty-Six Cents (\$73,587.66), plus One Fifty-Two Thousand One Hundred Four Dollars (\$152,104.00) in applicable interest. These assets

are reasonable believed to total at least One Hundred Ninety-Three Thousand Five Hundred Eight-Two Dollars & Seventy-Seven Cents (\$193,582.77) held by the State of Texas' Unclaimed Property Division.

- 8. Plaintiff declares under penalty of perjury that said corporation is indebted to plaintiff in the minimum amount of Two Hundred Twenty-Five Six Hundred Ninety-One Thousand Dollars & Sixty-Six (\$225,691.66), and this debt and/or claim has not been paid.
- 9. Since August 14, 1998, the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company's directors have abandoned all responsibility and obligation to wind up the defendant's affairs. Nevertheless, the defendant has continued to exist as an administratively dissolved corporation with an express responsibility to wind up such incidental affairs as provided in Ohio and Delaware corporation statutes. Corporate obligations have maintained their viability, and the defendant's directors continue to owe duty and obligations to the creditors like Plaintiff.
- 10. Plaintiff shows that based on fundamental concepts of equity and general dissolution practice, the assets of a dissolved corporation belong to its creditors and such assets continue to be subject to claims that have not been addressed during the required winding up activity.
- 11. Upon information and believe, Plaintiff believes that the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company is the legal owner of cash assets, and holder of a choses in action or claim in the amount of Two Hundred Twenty-Five Six Hundred Ninety-One Thousand Dollars & Sixty-Six (\$225,691.66).
- 12. Plaintiff would show that since the property described above reachable as a matter of equity and/or law by Defendant Lee Way Holding Company, and therefore said choses in action

is reachable and recoverable by Plaintiff and Assignee as the holder of claims, rights, and/or privileges against sa'd defendant as a victim of breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, gross mismanagement, fraud, negligent, etc.

- 13. Plaintiff would show that as a direct result of Defendant Lee Way Holding Company's breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, fraud, overreaching, gross misfeasance, nonfeasance, negligence, and/or gross mismanagement, said defendant has failed to recover and utilize the unclaimed property assets described above for payment of obligations owed to Plaintiff.
- 14. Plaintiff would show that damages have been sustained as a result of Defendants action and/or inaction.
- 15. Assignor discovered in May 2008 that the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company had failed to wind up its affairs by recovering, reclaiming, and maximizing the benefit of certain choses in action, tangible property or unclaimed assets. The Assignor has assigned his rights, interests, and privileges to Omega Consulting.
- 16. Neither Ohio, nor Delaware corporation statutes show any effort by Defendant Lee Way Holding Company to embrace the winding up provisions of the corporation statutes by sending the notices to known creditors as contemplated under the provisions of such statutes.

FIRST CAUSES OF ACTION (For Breach of Fiduciary Duty & Breach of Contract)

17. Defendant Lee Way Holding Company had an express and unavoidable duty and obligation to gather any remaining assets and pay any remaining debts, including the damages described herein.

- 17. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.
- 18. Defendant Lee Way Holding Company owed to Plaintiff a fiduciary duty to exercise due care in their oversight of the affairs of the company. The defendant's duty of care included, among other things:
 - the duty to remain adequately informed of the company's affairs, policies, practices, a. and procedures;
 - b. the duty to establish and maintain adequate internal controls to ensure that the company engaged in dissolution procedures in a prudent, reasonable and lawful manner;
 - the duty to supervise management and make sure that management carried out the c. company's policies, practices, and procedures;
 - d. the duty to act in the best interests of the company and/or its creditors;
 - the duty to ensure that management acted in the best interests of the Company and/or e. its creditors;
 - f. the duty to make informed decisions regarding the company's use and preservation of its assets;
 - the duty to prevent waste of the company's assets; g.
 - the duty to properly address and ensure resolution of significant issues that could h. adversely impact upon the equitable interests in the company's assets; and,
 - the duty to properly oversee and guide the company in its financial and corporate i.

affairs.

- 19. In discharging these duties, Defendant Lee Way Holding Company was required to exercise reasonable care.
- 20. Defendant Lee Way Holding Company has willfully, recklessly, grossly and negligently breached its fiduciary duty of care to creditors, including the Assignor, among other things:
 - failing to remain adequately informed regarding the gathering of assets and discharge a. of corporate liabilities;
 - failing to implement appropriate measures to insure that compliance with Texas' b. statutory and common law obligations to discharge the company's liabilities from the available assets;
 - failing implement appropriate measures to prevent the blatant failure of the company c. to pursue an acceptable dissolution process, leading to a deterioration and waste of corporate assets;
 - d. failing to prevent company management from violating applicable federal and state laws, rules, and regulations, or the company's policies, practices, and procedures;
 - failing to challenge inappropriate or potentially illegal conduct of management; e.
 - f. failing to act in the best interests of the company and failing to ensure that management acted in the best interests of the company;
 - failing to properly supervise company management in implementing appropriate and g. acceptable dissolution procedures;

- failing to make informed decisions regarding the company's use and preservation of its assets;
- exhibiting a conscious disregard and/or a reckless failure to address the known claims and liabilities of the company;
- j. failing to prevent waste of the company's assets
- 21. It is well settled under Ohio and/or Delaware law that a insolvent corporation, like Defendant Lee Way Holding Company, owes a duty to its creditors, including those such as Assignor, to gather the assets of the corporation and to discharge the liability owed to such Plaintiff. The company has breached this duty.
- 22. Plaintiff would show that the actions of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company are the result of willful mismanagement, gross negligence, and/or reckless disregard towards duties owed to creditors, including those such as Plaintiffs. Said company has intentionally, knowingly, and with conscious indifference failed to fulfill duties owed to creditors, including those like Plaintiff. With conscious indifference and/or intentional disregard and/or grossly negligent conduct, said company has allowed the assets of the corporation to be wasted and/or failed to take reasonable steps to ensure that the corporation's assets are utilized to discharge the liabilities owed to creditors, including those like Plaintiff.

ACTUAL AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES

23. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of his fiduciary duties, as described in the previous paragraphs, Plaintiff has sustained damages that exceed this Court's minimum jurisdictional amounts. Those damages total at least Two Hundred Twenty-Five Six

Hundred Ninety-One Thousand Dollars & Sixty-Six (\$225,691.66), which represents the original principle of Sevent. Three Thousand Five Hundred Eighty-Seven Dollars & Sixty-Six Cents (\$73,587.66), plus applicable interest for which damages, Plaintiff now sues.

24. Because the breach of fiduciary duty by the defendant is the result of willful mismanagement and/or gross negligence, and/or bad faith, then Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages, for which damages Plaintiff now sues in the amount of \$100,000, plus attorneys' fees and court costs.

SECOND CAUSES OF ACTION (For Gross Mismanagement)

- 25. Plain iff repeats and realleges each and every allegation set forth above in \$\Psi\$ 1-16 as if fully set forth herein.
- 26. Defendant Lee Way Holding Company had a fiduciary duty to properly supervise, direct and control the operations of said company and the activities of its management to ensure that said company was operated in a prudent, reasonable and lawful manner.
- 27. Additionally, and without limiting the previous causes of action, during the relevant time period when the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company was required to properly manage the affairs of said defendant company, Defendant Lee Way Holding Company either (I) failed to properly supervise management, (ii) knew or recklessly disregarded the unreasonable conduct of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company's management, and/or (iii) either approved such activities or, in bad faith, failed to take appropriate remedial measures to prevent or resolve them.
- 28. As a direct and proximate result of the gross mismanagement of the affairs of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company, creditors like Assignor and its Assignee, have suffered

damages. Damages sought from said defendant, in this instance, total Two Hundred Twenty-Five Six Hundred Ninety-One Thousand Dollars & Sixty-Six (\$225,691.66).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (For Waste Against Defendant and Does)

- 29. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation set forth above in ¶s 1-16 as if fully set forth herein.
- 30. Additionally, and without limiting the previous causes of action, Defendant Lee Way Holding Company had a fiduciary duty to creditors, like the Assignors and its Assignee, to properly supervise, direct and control the operations of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company and the activities of management subsequent to its administrative dissolution to prevent any waste of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company' assets.
- 31. During the relevant time period when the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company was required to prevent waste of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company' assets, the Defendants either:
 - (i) failed to properly supervise management,
 - (ii) knew or recklessly disregarded the unreasonable conduct of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company' management as described herein, and/or
 - (iii) either approved such activities, or, in bad faith, failed to take appropriate remedial measures to prevent or resolve them.
- As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant Lee Way Holding Company's gross 32. mismanagement of the affairs of Defendant Lee Way Holding Company, creditors like Assignor and its Assignee, suffered the damages as previously alleged herein.

33. By reason of the foregoing, Assignor suffered damages which rights thereto have been Assigned to Omega Consulting. Those damages total Two Hundred Twenty-Five Six Hundred Ninety-One Thousand Dollars & Sixty-Six (\$225,691.66).

REQUEST FOR TRIAL BY JUDGE

34. Plaintiff requests that this matter be tried before Judge, and reserves the right to request a jury trial.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Eric B. Dangerfield d/b/a Omega Consulting, as Assignee of Liquidation Services, Inc. prays that this Court enter appropriate orders as requested herein pursuant to law and equity for actual damages in the Total Amount of Two Hundred Twenty-Five Six Hundred Ninety-One Thousand Dollars & Sixty-Six (\$225,691.66), plus attorney fees, costs, and punitive damages in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000).

Dated: OMEGA CONSULTING, as Assignee of Mike Albert Leasing, Inc.

> Eric Dangerfield, Pro 7706 Pinebrook Dr San Antonio, Texas 78230

Tel-(210) 430-0649; Fax-(206) 888-4687

Email: omega77x7@yahoo.com

NOTARY ACKNOWLEDGMENT

BEFORE ME, in the County of BEX	AR, in the State of TEXAS, personally appeared ERIC
DANGERFIELD , who provided valid iden	ntification and executed this instrument.
DATE: 6-9-6	
and the second s	NOTARY PUBLIC 6/28/11
MORDECHAI B. HELBON MY COMMISSION EXPIRES June 28, 2011	MY Commission Expires:

SJS 44 (Rev 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

€ 3.7

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS **DEFENDANTS** Omega Consulting, as Assignee of Mike Albert Leasing, Inc. Lee Way Holding Company Hamilton, OH (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff BEXAR (TX) County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known) (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Eric Dangerfield d/b/a Omega Consuting; 7706 Pinebrook Dr; San Unknown Antonio, Tx 78230; Tel-(210) 430-0649; Fax-(206) 888-4687 III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) DEF U.S. Government ☐ 3 Federal Question PTF Citizen of This State Incorporated or Principal Place 0 4 **조** 4 Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business In This State **D** 5 3 2 U.S. Government Citizen of Another State **X** 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 7 ☑ 4 Diversity of Business In Another State Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) **1** 6 3 Foreign Nation \Box 6 Citizen or Subject of a \square 3 Foreign Country NATURE OF SUIT (Place an ")" in One Box Only) FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES CONTRACT TORTS PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 610 Agriculture 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reapportionment □ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug
☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure □ 120 Marine 362 Personal Injury -☐ 423 Withdrawal 410 Antitrust 310 Airplane Med. Malpractice 28 USC 157 430 Banks and Banking 130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product of Property 21 USC 881 450 Commerce ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability 365 Personal Injury -PROPERTY RIGHTS 460 Deportation □ 630 Liquor Laws ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck 470 Racketeer Influenced and 820 Copyrights & Enforcement of Judgmen Slander 368 Asbestos Personal R30 Patent Corrupt Organizations 650 Airline Regs. □ 151 Medicare Act 330 Federal Employers Injury Product 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 660 Occupational ■ 840 Trademark 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY Safety/Health 490 Cable/Sat TV Student Loans 340 Marine 810 Selective Service ☐ 690 Other (Excl. Veterans) 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment 371 Truth in Lending SOCIAL SECURITY 850 Securities/Commodities/ Liability LABOR of Veteran's Benefits 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards ■ 861 HIA (1395ff) Exchange 380 Other Personal 862 Black Lung (923) 875 Customer Challenge 160 Stockholders' Suits № 190 Other Contract

☐ 195 Contract 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage Act 385 Property Damage Product Liability 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 12 USC 3410 Product Liability 890 Other Statutory Actions 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI 360 Other Personal 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 196 Franchise & Disclosure Act ☐ 865 RSl (405(g)) Injury 892 Economic Stabilization Act REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS 740 Railway Labor Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS 893 Environmental Matters 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation 3 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 441 Voting 510 Motions to Vacate 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. or Defendant) 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 220 Foreclosure 442 Employment Sentence 🗖 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ■ 871 IRS—Third Party ☐ 895 Freedom of Information 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: Security Act 26 USC 7609 Accommodations Act ☐ 240 Torts to Land 530 General ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability IMMIGRATION 900Appeal of Fee Determination 444 Welfare 535 Death Penalty Under Equal Access 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 462 Naturalization Application 290 All Other Real Property ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus to Justice 550 Civil Rights Employment 950 Constitutionality of 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -Alien Detainee 555 Prison Condition State Statutes 465 Other Immigration Other 440 Other Civil Rights Actions Appeal to District V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Transferred from Judge from 6 Multidistrict Original 2 Removed from **□** 3 Remanded from Reinstated or **5** another district Magistrate Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Judgment (specify) Civil Statute under which filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint. CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION A UNDER F.R.C.P 23 ☐ Yes **⊅** No JURY DEMAND: **COMPLAINT:** VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions) JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER IF ANY OF RECORD RE OF FOR OFFICE USE ONLY APPLYING IFP AMOUNT MAG. JUDGE RECEIPT # JUDGE

AΟ	FORM	85	RECEIPT	REV.	9/04)	

United States District Court for the District of Delaware

Civil Action No.		3 3	7	
------------------	--	------------	---	--

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT FOR AO FORM 85

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION

I HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE RE	CEIPT OF	_ COPIES OF AO FORM 85.
6/6/08	Valuel	Boyer
(Date forms issued)	(Signature of Par	rty or their Representative)
	Printed name of	Party or their Representative)

Note: Completed receipt will be filed in the Civil Action

Ω_{mega}

7706 Pinebrook Drive • San Antonio, Tx 78230 • Phone-(210) 430-0649 • Fax-(206) 888-4687 • omega77x7@yahoo.com

June 5, 2008

Via Overnight Mail

U.S. District Court for Delaware

ATTN: CLERK OF COURT / FILING DEPARTMENT

J. Caleb Boggs Federal Bldg

844 North King Street

Wilmington, DE 19801-3519

Re: Omega Consulting (a Texas business) vs. Lee Way Holding (a Delaware company)

- 1. Original Complaint
- 2. Cover Sheet
- 3. Summons

Dear Sirs\Madams:

Please find enclosed a complaint against the above-referenced company and filing fee. Three prospective summons are also included, along with a self addressed stamped envelope.

Thanks for your prompt attention.

Respectfully yours,

Eric Dangerfield, P

7993 IIIN -6 AM II: 3

3 3 7